

Connecticut General Assembly – Environment Committee

Public Hearing March 13, 2017

Raised Senate Bill No. 995

***AN ACT CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF
CERTAIN LAND-BASED MARINE AND
FRESHWATER DEBRIS***

My name is John Chunis. I live at 40 Deerfield Run in Rocky Hill. I have been a resident and taxpayer in Connecticut since 1975.

I **oppose** this bill.

A deposit fee on bottle caps is unrealistic. How will this be implemented?

I can't image the problems that will be encountered when trying to return these caps to the automated machines. There are enough problems already with the bottles themselves. When they are rejected by the machine (not yet developed), we will all just have to bring the caps into the store customer service counter for the refund. This will create a huge cost additional for the store, a cost that will be passed on to consumers.

Manufacturers will also incur additional costs labelling bottle caps, more costs to be passed on to the consumers. This then will just become another tax, with people throwing bottle caps away in their blue box recycle bins and those few who litter, everywhere they currently throw them.

This tax is counter-productive, does not encourage recycling in our blue boxes, and just makes living in Connecticut more expensive. It will primarily impact our poor residents who don't have money to waste. But those whiskey drinkers on their expensive boats will not have to pay a bottled cap tax.

The ban on plastic utensils and straws is also unrealistic. What will be done when we buy food from a food vendor at a park during an event, who hands out food with plastic utensils? I guess we will have to eat our ice cream cups and chili with our fingers. What will I tell my 3 year old grand daughter when I tell her she can't get one of those juice packs that can only be consumed with the attached plastic straw. We might as well just ban people from our state parks. This bill will also primarily affect our poorer residents who rely on state parks for their only recreation.

The irresponsible 1% of the population who litter will continue to do so, and the 99% of the responsible people will be adversely impacted. I don't know why the state wants to punish the 99% with these added fees and bans.

I urge that this bill **not be approved**.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on this bill.